



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/209,799	12/11/98	HERMELING	R X-10242

ROBERT A CONRAD
ELI LILLY AND COMPANY
PATENT DIVISION/RSM
LILLY CORPORATE CENTER
INDIANAPOLIS IN 46285

HM11/0301

EXAMINER

MOEZIE, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED:

03/01/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/209,799	12/11/98	Hermeling	X-10242

EXAMINER	
F. Moegle	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1 of 2

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ATT. Steven Davis FAX 617-354-6355 (3)
(2) Ex. F. Moegle (4)

Date of Interview 2/22

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 2 - presented in a FAX communication 2/17/00

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant agreed to show (Declaration) that the prior art teachings do not produce the claimed crystals (comparative showing). The critical step in preparing the instant crystals is in the use of EtOH in the crystallization process. Therefore the product would have to be claimed by the process of making it. It

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview, unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

F. Moegle



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER F. Morzic	
ART UNIT 28/2	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Att Steven Davis (3) _____
(2) Ex. F. Morzic (4) _____

Date of Interview 2/22/00

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 7 - presented in a FAX communication of 2/17/00

Identification of prior art discussed: EP 619 322 + Kim et al

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: is clear that not all GLP-1 related entities are (would be) crystallizable under identical conditions. Hence, the claims would have to be limited to the enabling disclosure.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

FORM PTOL-413 (REV.1-96)

F. Morzic

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

MAILED:

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ATT. Steven Davis FAX 617-354-6355 (3)

(2) Ex. F. Moegle (4)

Date of Interview 2/22

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 2 - presented in a FAX communication 2/17/00

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant agreed to show (Declaration) that the prior art teachings do not produce the claimed crystals (comparative showing). The critical step in preparing the instant crystals is in the use of EtOH in the crystallization process. Therefore product would have to be claimed by the process of making it. It

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

F. Moegle

FORM PTOL-413 (REV.1-96)

OK	RESULT
2	PGS.
00:57	USAGE T
02/22 12:12	ST. TIME
	CONNECTION ID
	SUBADDRESS
916173546355	CONNECTION TEL
1258	TX/RX NO
	TRANSMISSION OK

*** TX REPORT ***	
